

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are currently pending in the application, as amended. Claims 5, 6 and 9-16 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6 and intervening claim 5. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from amended claim 1, as claim 7 was previously dependent upon canceled claim 6. No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments to claims 1 and 7 as the Amendment merely rewrites the allowable subject matter of claim 6 and intervening claim 5 into amended claim 1. The Specification has also been amended to incorporate the Title of the Invention suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, based upon the above amendments to Specification and Claims, no new matter has been added to the application.

**Election/Restriction**

The Examiner indicated in the Office Action that restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 and 372 to one of the following groups of claims:

- 1) Group I, claims 1-8, drawn to a device for handling an article such as a coil spring;
- 2) Group II, claims 9-13, drawn to an installation for handling an article such as a helical spring;
- 3) Group III, claims 14-16, drawn to a method of handling an article such as a helical spring.

Applicants confirm the election of Group I, comprised of claims 1-8, without traverse in accordance with the telephone conversation between the Examiner and Martin G. Belisario on May 18, 2010. Although not necessarily agreeing with the basis of the Examiner's restriction, claims 9-16 have been canceled from the present application to expedite the prosecution of the application.

**Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the Title of the Invention as not descriptive and has suggested that the current Title of the Invention be replaced by the phrase, "A Device for Handling an Article." Applicants have amended the title as requested by the Examiner and

respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification based upon the above-described Amendment.

**Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,897,043 (Giringer). The Examiner argues that Giringer discloses each of the elements of previously pending claims 1-5. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to claim 1, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of allowable claim 6 and intervening claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-described rejection of claims 1-5 has been rendered moot by amending claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of allowable claim 6 and intervening claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above-described rejection of claims 1-5, as amended.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicated that claims 6-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. As was described above, Applicants amended claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6 and intervening claim 5.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing Amendment and remarks, wherein independent claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6 and intervening claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-4, 7 and 8, as amended, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Stephane Chevallier

By Dennis J. Butler

Dennis J. Butler

Registration No.: 51,519

PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

(215) 965-1282

(215) 965-1331 (Fax)

dbutler@panitchlaw.com (E-Mail)

DB/jg